

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted after final rejection under 37 CFR 1.116 because Applicant believes that all claims now presented are in condition for allowance. In any event entry of this amendment will place the application in better form for appeal. No new matter has been added and no new issues have been raised. Finally the cancellation of claim 12, newly presented in Applicant's last response, is in direct response to the Examiner's refusal to examine that claim on the grounds that claim 12 was not originally elected. Thus Applicant could not have canceled claim 12 at an earlier date.

Applicant asks that the Examiner reconsider his final rejection of apparatus claims 7 through 11 as obvious under 35 USC 103 in view of the same art as previously applied, namely, PRIESTLY (A), MAYERS (B) and ANGELL (C). Applicant does not agree with the Examiner's statement on line 6 of page 3 of the office action that the MAYERS reference discloses a fixed bed (11) of granular fuel. MAYERS as well as the other two references disclose fluidized bed, not fixed bed reactors. Even more importantly the Examiner has completely ignored the language in claim 7, line 17 stating that the centrifugal separator "... is at least partially surrounded in said [fixed] bed...". Nowhere in any of the three cited references is there disclosure of a separator (e.g. cyclone) that is at least partially embedded in a bed of granular fuel (fixed or fluidized).

The Examiner has argued that the PRIESTLY reference discloses introduction of a gaseous fuel at the bottom of a reaction chamber containing the fluidized bed. However, the Examiner's argument has nothing to do with the patentability of the invention as presently claimed since the argument has nothing to do with a centrifugal separator that is at least partially embedded in a fixed bed of fuel.

The Examiner's arguments concerning dependent claims 9 and 10 should not be maintained because these claims are dependent upon claim 7 which requires that the centrifugal separator is at least partially embedded in a fixed bed.

Applicant believes that all claims now presented are in condition for allowance and a response to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
The Firm of Karl F. Ross P.C.



Jonathan Myers, Reg. No. 26,963
Attorney for Applicant

er
1 December 2004
5676 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: (718) 884-6600
Fax: (718) 601-1099